

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **26 July 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17-19, and 21. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-12, 14-15, 17-19, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Chaudhuri et al. (USPN 7,194,451, hereinafter “Chaudhuri”), in view of Chidlovskii (USPN 6,347,314, hereinafter “Chidlovskii”).

In the Advisory Action mailed on **12 September 2007**, Examiner maintained the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Chaudhuri in view of Chidlovskii.

In a phone conversation on **26 September 2007**, Examiner and Applicant discussed the rejections maintained by the Examiner in the Advisory Action. After coming to an agreement on the non-obviousness of embodiments of the present invention with respect to the cited prior art, Examiner suggested an amendment to the independent claims that would distinguish the independent claims from the cited prior art.

Applicant has entered the amendment to the independent claims suggested by the Examiner to distinguish the claims from the prior art. Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-5 and 7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-12 and 14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 17-19 and 21, which depend upon claim 15 are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims. Applicant therefore requests the withdrawal of the rejections to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) using Chaudhuri in view of Chidlovskii.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony P. Jones/
Anthony Jones
Registration No. 59,521

Date: 10 October 2007

Anthony Jones
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1666
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: tony@parklegal.com